



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/707,608	12/24/2003	CHIH-FENG SUNG	10217-US-PA	1607
31561	7590	12/03/2007	EXAMINER	
JIANQ CHYUN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE			TRAN, THUY V	
7 FLOOR-1, NO. 100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ROOSEVELT ROAD, SECTION 2				2821
TAIPEI, 100				
TAIWAN				
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
12/03/2007	ELECTRONIC			

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USA@JCIPGROUP.COM.TW

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/707,608	SUNG, CHIH-FENG	
	<b>Examiner</b> Thuy V. Tran	<b>Art Unit</b> 2821	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Thuy V. Tran. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Belinda Lee. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 23 November 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 12 and 21.

Identification of prior art discussed: Pub. No.: US 2002/0190924 A1 to Asano et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



THUY V. TRAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

- Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A teleconference was made in regard to the rejections of independent claims 12 and 21 and their dependent claims. Ms. Belinda Lee stated that the cited reference to Asano et al. failed to teach or suggest the claimed features recited in claims 12 and 21, such as "a first external power line dividing into a plurality of first internal power lines, wherein each first power line is electrically connected to at least two of the first pixels, and a second external power line dividing into a plurality of second internal power lines, wherein each second internal power lines is electrically connected to at least two of the second pixels". In response to this statement, the Examiner explained that Fig. 1 of the cited reference to Asano et al. clearly showed such limitations and pointed out each claimed feature contained therein. Ms. Belinda Lee further stated that the first and second external power lines as such were not disposed at two opposite sides of the pixel array. The Examiner concurred with this statement but suggested that such arrangement would have been deemed obvious to a person skilled in the art, as clearly made in the Office Action mailed on 09/05/2007. At last, the Examiner suggested that the claims should be provided with more details and the recited language should be clearly defined for a proper characterization of the claimed invention. An agreement was reached.